

REMARKS

Claims 2-7 were allowed.

Claims 1, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by admitted prior art.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to state that the frequency conversion block includes ~~a single~~ only one ~~second~~ frequency divider for dividing the oscillation frequency by a factor of two to generate a divided frequency.

In contrast to the amended independent claim 1, the admitted prior art cited by the Examiner, depicted in Figs. 3 and 5, and described on pages 3-8 of the specification, discloses two frequency dividers within the frequency conversion block.

The amendment to claim 1 is made to conform to the Examiner's Response to Arguments, (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 1, lines 3-14). Furthermore, in a telephonic interview with the Examiner conducted by Mr. Michael Markowitz on January 26, 2005, on information and belief, the Examiner indicated that this amendment would overcome the pending rejection, and would probably be allowable, without a further prior art search.

Independent claim 8 has been amended to state that multiplying the oscillation frequency by a factor of $(2N+1)/2$ uses N frequency mixers where N is a natural number greater than or equal to two.

In contrast to the amended independent claim 8, the admitted prior art cited by the Examiner only covers the case where $N=1$, (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 2, lines 7-9). The amendment to claim 8 is made to conform to the Examiner's Response to Arguments, (Office Action, page 2, paragraph 1, lines 15-17). The amendment to claim 8 is supported in the specification on page 10, lines 15-page 11, line 1. In the telephonic interview conducted with the

Examiner on January 26, 2005, on information and belief, the Examiner stated that the amendment made to claim 8 herein would overcome the pending rejection, but would probably require a further prior art search.

Independent claim 9 has been amended to provide that the quadrature modulator does not include a frequency multiplier. In contrast, the admitted prior art relied on by the Examiner and depicted in Figs. 3 and 5, includes a frequency multiplier 250. The Examiner, in the telephonic interview on January 26, 2005, on information and belief, stated that the amendment to claim 9 made herein would overcome the pending rejection, but would probably require a further prior art search.

CLOSING

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's objections. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that independent claims 1, 2, 5, 8, and 9 are in condition for allowance, as well as those claims dependent therefrom. Passage of this case to allowance is earnestly solicited.

However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, he is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper, not fully covered by an enclosed check, may be charged on
Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Bean
Reg. No. 44,528

CUSTOMER NO.: 026304

Phone No.: (212) 940-8729

Fax No.: (212) 940-8986/7

DOCKET NO.: 100933-16778 (NECN 18.304)

TJB:MIM:pm